

REMARKS

Status of Claims

In the Office Action mailed January 15, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 20 were pending. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 12 have been amended to further clarify the features therein. Claim 11 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 20 are pending for consideration which is respectfully requested.

Entry of Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because applicants' response does not significantly alter the scope of the claims and at least places the application into better form for appeal. The amendments to the claims merely clarify the features recited; therefore no new features or new issues are being raised.

Claim Objection

The January 15, 2008 Office Action objected to claim 11 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 11 has been cancelled herein, and thus, the rejection is moot. Applicants request the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schipper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,136) in view of Bolosky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,043,637). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "obtaining a number of high-order significant digits of the position information for restricting a position of encryption or decryption of the file from the input device," and "encrypting the file by using, as a key, data of the position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits." Support for this wording of these operations recited in claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12, of the Specification as filed. Applicants submit that the cited art fails to describe "obtaining a number of high-order significant digits" and encrypting the file using "the position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits" as recited in claim 1.

In contrast, Schipper merely describes basing an encryption key on position information that is related to location or an angle from a camera. For example, column 13, lines 53-70, of Schipper describes "the encryption key can depend upon the content of the position information... the location information and/or angular orientation information and/or time information can be expressed in bit array format and can be combined, bit by bit." In other words, Schipper does not describe the position information being specified by the "number of high-order significant digits." Moreover, column 8, lines 50-67, of Schipper describes "the encryption/decryption process may be a single key process, such as the Data Encryption Standard(EDS)." In other words, encryption/decryption process in Schipper is merely based on a conventional EDS standard and not "by using, as a key, data of the position information specified by the number of **high-order significant digits**" as recited in claim 1 (with emphasis added).

In addition, Bolosky fails to cure the deficiencies of Schipper described above. Bolosky merely uses a hash function when encrypting a file. For example, column 22, lines 13-20, of Bolosky describes "the verification module 228 calls the hash module 226 to compute a hash of the encrypted file segment in target block." Using a hash module, however, does not equate to "using, as a key, data of the position information specified by the number of **high-order significant digits**" as recited in claim 1 (with emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schipper and Bolosky, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest explicitly or implicitly (a) "obtaining a number of high-order significant digits of the position information for restricting a position of encryption or decryption of the file from the input device" or (b) "encrypting the file using data of the position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits as a key" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 2 as amended recites "performing a decryption process of the obtained encrypted file using data of the current position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits as a key." Support for such a feature can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12 and page 16, lines 15-24 of the specification. As described above, Schipper and Bolosky, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a decryption process using "the current position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits as a key" as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 5 as amended recites "obtaining a number of high-order significant digits of the position information for restricting a position of encryption or decryption of the file from the input device" and "an encrypting unit encrypting the file by using, as a key, data of the position

information specified by the number of high-order significant digits." Therefore, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Support for such a feature can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12 and page 11, line 14 to page 12, line 10 of the Specification.

Claim 6 as amended recites "a decryption unit... performing a decryption process of the obtained encrypted file using data of the current position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits as a key." Therefore, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Support for such a feature can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12, page 11, line 14 to page 12, line 10 and page 16, lines 15-24 of the Specification.

Claim 8 as amended recites "obtaining a number of high-order significant digits of the position information for restricting a position of encryption or decryption of the file from the input device" and "encrypting the file by using, as a key, data of the position information specified by the number of the high-order significant digits." Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Support for such a feature can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12 and page 11, line 14 to page 12, line 10 of the Specification.

Claim 9 as amended recites "performing a decryption process of the obtained encrypted file using data of the current position information specified by the number of high-order significant digits as a key." Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Support for such a feature can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 4-12 and page 16, lines 15-24 of the Specification.

Dependent claim 20 inherits the patentable recitations of its base claim, and therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited art at least for the reasons discussed above.

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schipper in view of Bolosky and in further view of Bel et al. (U.S. patent No. 7,124,304). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Bel fails to cure the deficiencies of Schipper and Bolosky described above. As dependent claims 12 and 14 inherit the patentable recitations of their base claim, claims 12 and 14 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees or credits associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 15, 2008

By: /Richard A. Gollhofer/
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501